

REMARKS

The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 5, 2007. Claims 1, 3 to 10, 22 to 33, and 37 to 42 are pending, of which Claims 22 to 33 were withdrawn from consideration pursuant to a restriction requirement. Claim 1 is the sole independent claim. Claims 2, 11 to 21, and 34 to 36 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 3 to 5, 8 to 10, 22, 26, 28 have been amended herein, which amendment includes the incorporation of subject matter from Claim 2 into Claim 1. Claims 37 to 42 have been newly added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

A new title of the invention has been provided, as required by the Office Action.

Claims 1 to 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Analytical Biochemistry, vol. 138, 1984, pp. 119-124 (Smith). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

According to a feature of the invention as recited by Claim 1, the biologically active substance is releasable from the transfer sheet.

Smith is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the above-discussed feature.

As described in Smith, an assay is formed by immobilizing antigen dots on a nitrocellulose sheet. See col. 119, right column, lines 8 to 12. The assay is then reacted with antibody solutions, and subsequently stained for screening. See col. 121, right column.

However, nowhere is Smith seen to describe that the antigen dots are releasable from the nitrocellulose sheet. In this regard, Applicants respectfully submit that it was known that nitrocellulose readily absorbs a variety of substances.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from the independent claim discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

With respect to dependent Claim 4, Applicants respectfully submit that Smith fails to disclose or suggest the feature of two or more holding areas holding different biologically active substances or different combinations of two or more biologically active substances. With respect to dependent Claim 5, Applicants respectfully submit that Smith fails to disclose or suggest the feature of two or more holding areas holding a biologically active substance in different concentrations.

The Office Action places reliance on page 121, left column, lines 3 and 4, and right column, lines 2 to 6 of Smith for the above-discussed features recited by Claims 4 and 5. However, these portions of Smith are merely seen to describe that 12 channels are formed so that 12 antibody solutions can be assayed simultaneously. Nowhere is Smith seen to describe that different antigens or different combinations of antigens are immobilized in two or more areas, or that an antigen is immobilized in different concentrations in two or more areas.

With respect to non-elected method Claims 22 to 33, rejoinder of these claims is respectfully requested upon the allowance of Claim 1, pursuant to MPEP 821.04(b).

The application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Damond E. Vadnais
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 52,310

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 1650455v1